

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
8

9 KENNETH HATLEN,)

3:12-cv-00534-MMD-WGC

10 Plaintiff,)

ORDER

11 vs.)

re: Plaintiff's Motion to Discuss & Hearing
Safety & Security of Plaintiff
Doc # 102

12 GREG COX, et al.,)

13 Defendants.)
14

15 Before the court is Plaintiff's "Motion to Discuss & Hearing Safety & Security of Plaintiff." (Doc
16 # 102.) Defendant have opposed (Doc. # 109) and Plaintiff has replied (Doc. # 116).

17 The court interprets Plaintiff's motion similarly as Defendants have characterized it, i.e., "a
18 forum in which to air [Plaintiff's] numerous complaints and to raise issues not specifically articulated
19 through his motion. (# 102 at 15)." (Doc. # 109 at 2.) The court notes that Plaintiff's allegations which
20 have survived screening are before the court. (Doc. # 44.) The court does not perceive it appropriate to
21 provide Plaintiff a hearing to allow him to voice additional generalized complaints against Defendants
22 and/or the Nevada Department of Corrections. In addition to the allegations in Plaintiff's complaint, the
23 Plaintiff has alleged his security concerns in innumerable motions for temporary restraining orders and
24 preliminary injunctions.

25 Plaintiff's motion to discuss and hearing (Doc. # 102) is **DENIED**.

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27 DATED: October 31, 2013

28 

WILLIAM G. COBB
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE